

Appln. No. 10/037,048

Attorney Docket No. 10541-887

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this amendment, claims 2-8, 10, and 12-13 remain pending.

Claim Amendments

Claim 2 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which is regarded as the invention. The claim clarifies the order of injecting resin and applying pressure, with the applying pressure step using the forming means to press the resin and fiberglass against the mold cavity. In addition, claim 9 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite on the basis that it fails to clearly define the meaning of the phrase "a manual installer." As a result, claim 9 has been cancelled. Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-4, 6-10, 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,540,877 ("Repetto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As noted by the Examiner, Repetto discloses a method of making a fiber reinforced resin transfer molded frame for a game racquet. The frame is formed by inserting a dry filament tube, with an inflatable bladder inside, into a mold. Repetto,

-5-

BRINKS
HOFFER
GILSON
ALONE

Appln. No. 10/037,048

Attorney Docket No. 10541-887

col. 4, lines 34-35. After the bladder is inflated, a polymer resin is injected into the mold cavity and pressure is applied by the injected resin. See *id.* at col. 6, lines 23-40. In contrast, claim 2 of the present invention recites a method where pressure is applied using the forming means, not the resin. Therefore, it is submitted that Repetto fails to disclose a method where pressure is applied using a forming means after the injection of resin material. The rejection based thereon should accordingly be withdrawn.

Furthermore, claim 7 recites an inflatable forming means having a shape corresponding to a leaf spring. On the other hand, Repetto discloses an inflatable tubular plastic bladder. *Id.* at col. 3, lines 40-41. From this it is submitted that Repetto fails to disclose an inflatable forming means with a shape corresponding to a leaf spring. The rejection based thereon should accordingly be withdrawn.

Claims 3-6, 8, 10 and 12-13 are all dependent upon claims 2 or 7 and the arguments presented above are equally applicable to these claims. The rejections based thereon should accordingly be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,540,877 ("Repetto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The comments presented above regarding claim 2 are equally applicable to the present rejection in that Repetto fails to disclose every element claimed in the present invention. The rejection under § 103(a) should accordingly be withdrawn.

BRINKS
HOFFER
DILSON
ALONE

Appln. No. 10/037,048


Attorney Docket No. 10541-887

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

September 21, 2005
Date



Eric J. Sosenko (Reg. No. 34,440)

Attachments: None

EJS/DPH/AEL